DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 257 SP 007 493

AUTHOR	Burns, W. J.; And Others
TITLE	Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Attain Their Learning Goals?
INSTITUTION	Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio.
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	37p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperating Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to test the effectiveness of center vs. noncenter student teacher training. Effectiveness was defined as the degree to which student teachers accomplished goals in one term of student teaching. Comparisons were made using four self-report inventories administered to student teachers and cooperating teachers at the beginning and end of a practice teaching term. The preterm inventory asked the student teacher and the cooperating teacher to rate what each expected the student teacher to accomplish during the term; the postterm inventory asked both parties to rate what they had accomplished. Accepted chance of false rejection of the null hypothesis (i.e., that there is no difference between the groups) was set at an alpha level of .05. On no single category of student teacher self-reports was there a significant difference in expectations. The major hypothesis, that center student teachers would accomplish more of their learning goals than noncenter student teachers, was rejected. Further unanticipated results indicated that center cooperating teachers' expectations for their student teachers were no higher than noncenter teachers'. Hence, teacher education centers helped student teachers no more or no less than cooperating teachers who deal with student teachers on a one-to-one basis; i.e., mode of student teaching alone did not significantly improve the quality of learning. (JB)

ED 084257

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS: DO THEY HELP STUDENT TEACHERS ATTAIN THEIR LEARNING GOALS?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to the Education Committee, Members of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, and the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation

by

Dr. W. J. Burns, Executive Director, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education

Dr. Patrick Cosiano, Chairman, Evaluation Task Group, Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee

Dr. Edward J. Fox, Director, SITE Project

Mrs. Joanne Kaufman, President, Urban Reports Corporation

with the collaboration of

Dr. Rama Vakil, Director of Evaluation, Positive Education Program (PEP)

Produced through the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education

as part of the

Project to Stimulate Innovation in Teacher Education (SITE).

November 1973

SP 007 493

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

I. INTRODUCTION

A three year project to Stimulate Innovative Teacher Education Programs in Greater Cleveland Schools, Colleges and Universities (SITE Project) was conducted by the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education from 1970 to 1973 under a grant from the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation. Seven colleges and universities, 50 public schools and 17 independent and parochial schools participated in the Project. The overriding goal of the Project was to improve the quality of teacher preparation during the student teaching clinical experience. A network of teacher education centers was developed throughout Greater Cleveland. These centers became the arenas in which faculty and cooperating teachers worked together to stimulate innovative teacher education.

The SITE Project produced a number of tangible outcomes: (a) during the '72-'73 school year 35 teacher education centers in Greater Cleveland were in operation or development;[1] (b) the Cuyahoga County School Superintendents' Association and the Ohio State Education Deans Association endorsed the center concept;[2] (c) at the operational level college faculty have committed themselves to stimulate further improvement of teacher education; (d) the SITE Project Centers Coordinating Committee (TECCC) has agreed to continue its coordinating function after the project grant ends; (e) the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education has agreed to continue in-kind assistance to the TECCC; and (f) much has been learned about the capacity of colleges and universities to adapt themselves to the needs of local school systems. Colleges and universities share control of teacher

---

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] Ohio Teacher Education: A Position Paper (published by State University Education Deans, March, 1973), p. 21.

education with the State Department of Education. However, superintendents and other school officials are influencing the ways in which teachers are trained by describing with greater precision the kinds of teachers needed in the schools.

The SITE Project began with this assumption: the improvement of teacher education would be accelerated if college faculty and school practitioners worked closely together to upgrade the student teacher clinical experience. Consequently, the SITE Project urged that student teachers should be trained in school-based clusters in which college professors, cooperating teachers and school administrators could collaborate to help student teachers accomplish more than could be accomplished in the traditional one-to-one kind of student teaching experience.

SITE Project participants were determined to measure the extent to which these centers improved the quality of the clinical experience. More particularly, educators urged that a comparison be made between the effectiveness of the center training and the conventional, non-center training of student teachers. An impact study was conducted to test one index of effectiveness of center vs. non-center student teacher training. The remainder of this report presents the results of this comparative impact study.

There are many possible outcomes of student teaching and more than one index of effectiveness is possible. Since the centers were designed to build in flexibility, to open new options and to emphasize individual learning goals, it was determined that the accomplishment of one's own learning goals was one of the most desirable outcomes of this learning experience. Thus, effectiveness was defined as the degree to which student

teachers accomplished their own learning goals in one term of student teaching.

To compare the relative effectiveness of these 2 modes of training, 4 self-report inventories were developed by the representatives of the teacher education departments of Cleveland State, John Carroll, Kent State and Ohio Universities along with the SITE Project Director and a staff member of Urban Reports Corporation. In addition, a survey identified factors which facilitated or hindered the student teachers in accomplishing their goals.

The inventories contained 68 items which were then grouped into 7 categories of teacher behavior described in the Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies: (a) assessing and evaluating student behavior; (b) planning instruction; (c) conducting and implementing instruction; (d) participating in management; (e) communicating; (f) developing personal skills; and (g) developing pupil self.[3] The 68 items were selected from a list of some 300 statements taken from the literature on student teaching.[4] The representatives mentioned above constituted the panel of experts who used decision-making by consensus to select and categorize the items.

The inventories, composed of 68 behavioral goal statements, were administered to student teachers and cooperating teachers at the beginning and at the end of the practice teaching term. The pre-term inventory asked the student teacher and the cooperating teacher to rate what each expected the student teacher to accomplish during the clinical experience.

---

[3]Florida Catalog of Teacher Competencies, Department of Education, State of Florida, Tallahassee, 1973.

[4]See Appendix B.

The post-term inventory which contained the same 68 items, asked both parties to rate what was accomplished during the clinical experience.

The Urban Reports Corporation and the SITE Project Director of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education selected the sample for investigation. From the 35 teacher education centers, 16 centers were found to meet the following criteria:

1. At least 5 student teachers would be clustered at the center during the Winter term 1972-73;
2. The center had been in operation at least 1 previous term;
3. The center had a coordinator (full or part-time):
4. Formal or informal inservice teacher education training had been or was being conducted with cooperating teachers;
5. The university which placed student teachers in the center had also placed a comparable number of student teachers in clinical experiences in non-center situations.

Of the 7 colleges and universities participating in the SITE Project only 4 had centers which met all 5 criteria at the time of the study. Data from these 4 institutions were used to test the study's hypotheses since the research design required a comparison of student teachers in centers with their classmates not in centers. (No attempt was made to compare expectations and accomplishments among institutions.)

The inventories were administered during the Winter term, 1972-73. In several cases the instruments were administered to small groups. In the majority of cases they were administered individually by mail.

The total sample included 314 student teachers and 314 cooperating teachers. Sixty percent (60%) or 187 student teachers and 172 cooperating teachers completed and returned the pre-term inventory. The post-term

inventory was administered to those who completed the first inventory. One-hundred thirty-nine (139) student teachers and 142 cooperating teachers completed and returned the post-term inventory. Of these returns 62 student teachers and their 62 immediate supervisors (cooperating teachers) completed both the pre-term and post-term inventories. A stratified random sub-set of 28 center and 28 non-center matched pairs was selected for study. This stratified random sub-set included matched pairs which cut across lower elementary, upper elementary, middle/junior high and senior high school levels.

The overall rate of return of inventories was high (64.8 %), despite the logistics of distribution and administration.[5] An effort was made to determine if the expectations of student teachers (139) who returned both the pre-term and post-term inventories differed significantly from the expectations of those (48) who returned only the pre-term inventory.

Based on the comparison of categories (no differences) and the individual items (7 differences out of 68 items) it was safe to conclude that those student teachers who completed the pre-term and post-term inventories are similar as a group to those who responded to only the pre-term inventory.

II. FINDINGS: INVENTORIES

Since this study was concerned with comparing the accomplishments of student teachers in the centers with those of students in the more traditional placements, the researchers selected an alpha level of .05 (i.e. a 5 % risk that the null hypothesis may be rejected when there is no difference between the two groups). The statistical analysis used the standard SPSS computer program yielding appropriate T-values.

---

[5]See Table I.

Since there were no reliability or validity coefficients available for the inventory items nor was there statistical confirmation of the items when added together or treated by categories, the researchers chose to independently analyze each item and each category of items.

Student teachers trained in centers were assumed to have similar expectations to those placed in the more traditional student teaching settings. This assumption was made because student teachers from the same institution had similar teacher training before their placements. This assumption was tested.

On no single category of student teacher self-reports was there a significant difference in expectations even though differences did exist on 4 single items.[6] Thus, the assumption was upheld. Student teachers in centers and those not in centers began their clinical experiences with similar expectations for accomplishment.

(A) Student Teacher Accomplishments: The Major Hypothesis

The major hypothesis of this study was: that center student teachers would accomplish more of their learning goals than did their classmates whose clinical training occurred in the non-center traditional mode. This hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean scores on the post-term inventory for center student teachers with those of non-center student teachers.[7] On 2 items (as hypothesized) center student teachers had significantly higher mean scores than non-center student teachers. Faced with this unexpected result, the data were reexamined to see if statistical differences existed in the direction of the non-center group. On 1 entire category

---

[6] See Table II.

[7] See Table III.

(Participating in Management) and on 8 items non-center student teachers had significantly higher mean scores than center student teachers.[8]

These results were tested further by comparing the center and non-center cooperating teacher ratings of their student teachers. A two-tailed test was used since a directional hypothesis had not been made originally. On 4 of 68 items the non-center cooperating teacher ratings were significantly higher than center cooperating teacher ratings. On no items or categories did the cooperating teacher ratings favor the student teachers in centers.[9]

These combined findings suggest that student teachers in centers did not reach a higher level of accomplishment than their classmates in the traditional mode of student teaching. On the whole, their accomplishments appear to be at the same level with the possible exception of participating in management, the category of items on which non-center students scored significantly higher than center students.

(B) Cooperating Teachers' Expectations for Student Teachers: A Secondary Hypothesis.

This study also set out to test whether center cooperating teachers expected their student teachers to learn more than non-center cooperating teachers who trained student teachers in one-to-one arrangements. This hypothesis was examined to determine whether college and university faculty had successfully transferred responsibility for student teaching supervision to the center cooperating teachers. By intent the centers encouraged college and university personnel to provide a supporting role to cooperat-

---

[8] See Table IV.

[9] See Table V.

ing teachers, including in-service training. The in-service training was designed to help cooperating teachers become more proficient as teacher educators. In addition, since center cooperating teachers tended to be involved with student teachers each term (as opposed to once a year or less as is the policy in many schools without centers), they were expected to have a better grasp of what was to be accomplished during the student teaching clinical experience. Finally, if the school-college partnership of the center is viable, one would expect the partners to have negotiated realistic learning goals for the clinical experience. One might also expect that cooperating teachers, who worked alongside college faculty, would have higher expectations than their counterparts who rarely see faculty from colleges of education.

No evidence was found to support the hypothesis that center cooperating teachers had higher expectations for student teachers. (This result was also not anticipated.) The data were then re-examined to determine whether center cooperating teachers had significantly lower expectations than non-center cooperating teachers for their student teachers. On 30 out of 68 items and on 6 of 7 categories, center cooperating teachers had significantly lower expectations than those of non-center cooperating teachers.[10]

(C) Additional Comparisons

In an effort to extend our perspective on possible differences among center and non-center student teachers and cooperating teachers, 4 additional questions were examined without posing directional hypothesis. The first question was *did student teachers accomplish what they set out to accomplish?*

---

[10] See Table VI.

The findings indicate that center student teachers met their expectations on 57 items and on all 7 categories, exceeded their expectations on 3 items,[11] and fell short of their expectations on 8 items.[12] Non-center student teachers met their expectations on 57 items and 6 categories, exceeded their expectations on 6 items and on the category of "participating in management,"[13] and fell short of their expectations on 5 items.[14]

The results also show that center and non-center student teachers needed assistance in several areas. By identifying the behaviors which were grouped in the highest quartile of expectations[15] and assessing the most significant gaps between expectations and accomplishments it is clear that center student teachers could have used assistance to: (a) learn and test out the most effective new ideas in teaching (item #11); (b) develop a sense of personal worth in pupils (item #19); (c) encourage "turned off" pupils to become motivated (item #42); (d) respond constructively to hostile pupils (item #51); and (e) learn to use pupil feedback to improve as a teacher (item #59). Non-center students needed assistance to: (a) select teaching strategies to facilitate efficient learning (item #14); (b) encourage "turned off" pupils to become motivated (item #42); and (c) develop a teaching style which is compatible with one's own talents and personality (item #60).

---

11 See Table VII.

12 See Table VIII.

13 See Table IX.

14 See Table X.

15 See Table XI.

The second question was *did cooperating teachers believe that the student teachers accomplished what should have been accomplished during student teaching?* Center cooperating teachers reported that their student teachers met their expectations on 57 items and all 7 categories, exceeded their expectations on 5 items,[16] and fell short of their expectations on 6 items.[17] Non-center cooperating teachers reported that their student teachers met their expectations on 53 items and 6 categories, and fell short on 15 items and 1 category "conducting or implementing instruction".[18]

Center cooperating teachers reported that student teachers needed assistance to accomplish several goals. Of the goals valued most highly (upper quartile of expectations),[19] the cooperating teachers were least satisfied with center student teacher performance in: (a) selecting teaching strategies to facilitate efficient learning (item #14); (b) selecting the best media to accomplish learning objectives (item #15); (c) using methods and materials which were sensitive to individual pupil's feelings, needs and values (item #18); (d) developing a sense of personal worth in pupils (item #19); (e) learning how to seek needed help (item #32); (f) developing a teaching style which was true to the student teacher's talents and personality (item #60); and (g) asking penetrating questions which help

---

16 See Table XII.

17 See Table XIII.

18 See Table XIV.

19 See Table XI.

pupils to think clearly and deeply (item #68). Non-center cooperating teachers felt that student teacher performance needed improvement in the following areas: (a) selecting the best media to accomplish learning objectives (item #15); (b) developing a sense of personal worth in pupils (item #19); (c) communicating well with pupils in groups and in one-to-one situations (items #39, 40, and 41); (d) deciding whether teaching is the "right" career (item #56); (e) learning to use pupil feedback to improve as a teacher (item #59); (f) developing a teaching style which is true to one's own talents and personality (item #60); and (g) asking penetrating questions which help pupils to think clearly and deeply (item #68). Moreover, non-center student teachers failed to meet the expectations of their cooperating teachers on 2 categories: "conducting and implementing instruction" and "communicating."

The third question was *how did cooperating teachers' expectations compare with their student teachers' expectations for the student teaching experience?* Center cooperating teachers had higher expectations on only 1 item, similar expectations on 52 items and 4 categories, and lower expectations on 15 items and 3 categories ("communicating," "developing personal skills" and "developing pupil self".)[20] Non-center cooperating teachers had higher expectations on 2 items and similar expectations on 66 items and all 7 categories.[21]

The final question was *how did the cooperating teachers' ratings of accomplishments compare with their student teachers' self-ratings?* Center

---

[20] See Table XV.

[21] See Table XVI.

cooperating teachers rated accomplishments higher on 1 item than did the student teachers, similar on 49 items and 4 categories, and lower on 18 items and 3 categories ("communicating," "developing personal skills," and "developing pupil self").[22] Non-center cooperating teachers' ratings of accomplishments were the same as their student teacher's self-ratings on 62 items and 7 categories and lower on 6 items.[23]

III. FINDINGS: TELEPHONE SURVEY

Within 2 weeks after the post-term inventories were returned, a telephone survey was conducted to identify specific factors which helped or hindered the accomplishment of the student teacher goals. Twenty (20) student teachers and 10 cooperating teachers from both the centers and non-center participants were randomly selected from the 139 student teachers and 142 cooperating teachers who completed both the pre-term and post-term inventories. Several open-ended questions[24] were used to gather the survey data. Nine factors were identified as helping or hindering the clinical student teaching experience. The data, converted into percentages, were used to further compare center and non-center performance.

A. Hindering Factors

Beginning with hindering factors, 25% of the student teachers, both in centers and not in centers, mentioned the limitations placed on them by the school systems. Class routines and course outlines were reported to be so prescribed and rigid that student teachers had no opportunity to adapt their own philosophies and methods of teaching.

---

22 See Table XVII.

23 See Table XVIII.

24 See Appendix C.

The most frequently mentioned hindering factor was that college of education courses did not prepare the student teacher for classroom teaching. Center cooperating teachers and student teachers (80% and 50% respectively) stressed this factor as did the non-center cooperating teachers and student teachers (20% and 25% respectively). The student teachers reported that these education courses were too "philosophical," "idealistic" or "theoretical" and inadequate as preparation for actual classroom teaching.

The center seminar programs were reported to be ineffectual. In fact, 20% of the center student teachers felt the seminars were a hindering factor because they interfered with the flow of productive time in the classroom and that seminar time was spent doing unproductive paper work such as preparing resumes for future employment.

B. Helping Factors

Cooperating teachers were cited most frequently as helping center and non-center student teachers accomplish their learning goals. Sixty-five percent (65%) of all student teachers attributed their successes to the assistance of cooperating teachers. In addition, 55% of the student teachers in the centers identified the principal and other teachers within the school as helping forces. Tutoring and previous teaching experience were also listed frequently as helping factors. Fifty percent (50%) of the non-center cooperating teachers and 10% of the center cooperating teachers identified special resource rooms as useful. Only 10% of the center student teachers identified these resource rooms as helpful or useful.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions are drawn from the evaluation of the center and non-center experiences of student teachers.

(1) No evidence supports the major hypothesis that center student teachers accomplished more of their learning goals than non-center student teachers. Both groups of student teachers rated their levels of accomplishment about the same.

(2) Non-center cooperating teachers clearly held significantly higher expectations for their student teachers than did center cooperating teachers.

(3) Both center and non-center student teachers tended to accomplish what they set out to accomplish during the clinical experience.

(4) Center student teachers tended to meet their cooperating teachers' expectations. Non-center student teachers tended to fall short of their cooperating teachers' expectations in 1 category.

(5) Center cooperating teachers tended to have lower expectations than did their student teachers on 3 categories. Non-center cooperating teachers and their student teachers had similar levels of expectations.

(6) Center student teachers felt they accomplished more than their cooperating teachers felt they accomplished. Non-center student teachers and cooperating teachers tended to agree on what was accomplished.

(7) Both center and non-center student teachers reported that the rigidities of the school systems interfered with their own teaching styles and student teaching experience.

(8) Both center and non-center student teachers reported that the college education courses failed to prepare them for actual classroom teaching.

(9) Both center and non-center student teachers reported that cooperating teachers, principals, other teachers plus prior tutoring experience and classroom teaching were the most helpful factors in their clinical experience.

V. DISCUSSION AND SOME SPECULATION

The title of this report posed this question: "Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Obtain Their Learning Goals?" The answer which emerges from the evaluation data is "yes" but no more or no less than the cooperating teachers who dealt with student teachers in a one-to-one setting. In short, one could conclude that, with everything else being equal, center programs represent another option to student teachers, colleges of education, and school systems.

One piece of evidence in the data is both interesting and disturbing. Center cooperating teachers had significantly lower expectations for what could be accomplished during student teaching than non-center cooperating teachers and significantly lower expectations than the center student teachers themselves. Were there selection procedures at work which drew to non-center situations cooperating teachers with higher expectations and to centers, cooperating teachers with lower expectations? Is there something in the traditional setting where teachers are given nearly total responsibility for supervision that sustains or raises their expectations? Or, is there something operating within the configuration of the centers

that depresses expectations? Answers to these questions cannot be found in this evaluation because this unexpected trend fell outside the scope of the study.

One thing is clear, however. The quality of teacher education will not be improved significantly by merely altering the mode of student teaching. One trend which emerges from the study could be called the "Pygmalion effect," the relationship between high expectations and increased accomplishments. The name is derived from the Greek myth about how Pygmalion created Galatea out of ivory and desire. Contemporary psychologists identified the Pygmalion effect as that power of expectation which influences the behaviors of others. It is sometimes called the self-fulfilling prophecy when people become what we prophesy for them.

Experimenters have found that they would improve their subjects' performances by expecting them to do well. Studies conducted in schools showed that the teachers' expectations directly influenced students at all levels. When teachers expected students to accomplish more than was normal, students did accomplish more. The same relationship is found among employed adults. When supervisors expected a high job performance from trainees, in most cases tested, the trainees accomplished more.

The results of the SITE Project evaluation of student teacher accomplishments indirectly point to the Pygmalion effect. Whether student teachers improve themselves during the practice teaching experience may have more to do with what is expected of them than how the clinical experience is organized. The evaluation study leaves us with at least one interesting speculation: If the center cooperating teachers held the same high expectations as their counterparts, would the center student teachers have accomplished significantly more than their fellow contemporaries who were trained in the traditional practice teaching mode?

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee

1972-73
Listing of Teacher Education Centers

(By sponsoring college/university)

January 15, 1973

(301) Baldwin-Wallace College - Mr. James Currens
Director - Lab Experience
826-2168

(030) Chapman Elementary School - Strongsville
(029) Seven Hills Elementary School - Parma
*(021) (Parma Secondary Teacher Ed. Center - Parma)

(302) Case Western Reserve University - Dr. Ruth Mueller
Director - Teacher Education
368-2260

(003) Cleveland Hts. High School (English) - Cleveland Heights
(013) Hawken School (Lower) - Independent
(019) Mentor High School (Math & Science) - Mentor
(025) Prospect Elementary School - East Cleveland
(011) Shaker Heights High School (Soc. St.) - Shaker Heights

(303) Cleveland State University - Dr. Robert McNaughton
Director - Student Teacher Placement
687-4572

**(002) Beachwood Middle School - Beachwood
(014) John F. Kennedy High School (Eng.) - Cleveland
(015) Kirk Junior High School - East Cleveland
(034) Lake Elementary Center - Mentor
(017) Lincoln-West High School
(018) (Soc. St. & Math.) - Cleveland
(028) Padua Franciscan High School (Eng.) - Independent
(004) Parma Elementary T.E.C. - Parma
(027) James F. Rhodes High School (Eng.) - Cleveland
(008) St. Edward High School (Soc. St.) - Independent
(026) Shaw High School (Math.) - East Cleveland
(022) South High School (Bus. Ed.) - Cleveland

(304) John Carroll University - Dr. John Morford
Coordinator of Teacher Education
491-4331

**(001)	Beachwood Elementary Center	- Beachwood
**(002)	Beachwood Middle School	- Beachwood
(031)	Byron Jr. High School (Math.)	- Shaker Hts.
(012)	Gilmore-Glen Oaks Schools	- Independent
(006)	Mayfield Center Elementary School	- Mayfield
(005)	Roxboro Junior High School	- Cleveland Heights
(023)	Taylor Road Elementary School	- Cleveland Heights

(305) Kent State University - Dr. Richard Hawthorne
Director of Professional Field Experiences
672-2838

**(001)	Beachwood Elementary Center	- Beachwood
**(002)	Beachwood Middle School	- Beachwood
(016)	Grant Elementary School	- Lakewood
(033)	Mentor Elementary Center	- Mentor
(020)	Mentor Junior High Center	- Mentor
(007)	North Olmsted Elementary Center	- North Olmsted
(021)	Parma Secondary Teacher Educa. Cent.	- Parma
(032)	Solon-Orange Center (Elem.-Second.)	- Solon and Orange
(024)	Walton Elementary School	- Cleveland

(306) St. John College of Cleveland - Sister M. Josetta
Dean - Department of Education
771-2388

(010)	Chambers Elementary School	- East Cleveland
(008)	St. John - Diocese of Cleveland (11 Elementary Schools)	

(307) Notre Dame College

(308) Ursuline College

(309) Ohio University
(Center involvement in Parma under development).

(310) Bowling Green University

(311) Allegheny College

*Potential partnership in discussion.
**Indicates joint college/university sponsorship.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Teacher Behaviors

NOTE: The 68 basic statements listed below were used on each of the four instruments described on page 3. On the two accomplishments instruments the wordings are altered slightly to fit grammatically with the lead-in phrasing.

Category A: Assessing and evaluating student behavior.

(1) Assess a student's motivation to learn so that I know what "turns him on."

(2) Collect, analyze, and use comprehensive data about an individual student in a way which involves the student in helping to plan his own learning.

(3) Assess student learning with methods which are consistent with both learning styles and the learning goals.

(4) Develop an efficient procedure for collecting data about students and an effective (useful) format for recording it.

(5) Learn the grading system used and its rationale, standards and procedures.

(6) Identify students with special learning problems in time to seek appropriate extra help to cope with these if necessary.

Category B: Planning instruction.

(7) Plan a detailed unit of instruction so that it fits the goals of the entire course or year's program.

(8) Select or write learning objectives which are realistic for individual students and for which progress in student achievement can be measured.

(9) Learn what educational facilities are available for instruction and what, if any, restrictions on their use apply to me.

(10) Expand my knowledge of available instructional materials and how to evaluate their potential usefulness in my teaching.

(11) Learn where to secure new ideas for teaching and how to determine if they are effective for my teaching.

(12) Use community resources in my instructional program.

Category C: Conducting or implementing instruction.

(13) Budget my time and actions in classroom settings so that the priority learning objectives for each session are given their proper emphasis.

(14) Select teaching strategies which are most likely to facilitate learning as efficiently as possible.

(15) Select and use the media which best serves a particular learning objective.

(16) Learn how to schedule, secure and operate all of the available A-V equipment and instructional materials.

(17) Plan and implement learning experiences for individual students.

(18) Use teaching methods and materials which are sensitive to individual students' feelings, needs and values.

(19) Teach groups in such a way that each individual student has a sense of personal worth.

(20) Present concepts, facts, and generalizations from specific discipline areas in such a way that individual students can learn them in their proper perspectives.

(21) Learn to relate to children whose learning behaviors are very different from the average.

(22) Apply educational theories to understand and relate to actual student behaviors.

(23) Use my own special personal skills and knowledges (hobbies, special talents) to help students learn.

(24) Learn a variety of effective and efficient ways to arrange furniture, equipment and seating to maximize desirable patterns of student interactions and other learning activities.

(25) Assume responsibility for accepting and completing assigned instructional tasks.

(26) Act as a sensitive, creative, and contributing member of an instructional team.

(27) Learn to coordinate my teaching activities with those of other school personnel when this is required or beneficial to the total school program.

Category D: Participating in management.

(28) Learn how and by whom the school plant is maintained and how I can use maintenance services to serve the teaching-learning function.

(29) Learn to use my special skills to fulfill my responsibilities in assignments such as extra-class activities, study hall, cafeteria, library, and playground duties.

(30) Learn the scope and importance of school routines like working hours, meetings, reports and extra-class activities.

(31) Learn the procedures and schedules for reporting attendance, grades and other required data.

(32) Learn how and with whom to consult for help when I am having difficulties in teaching.

(33) Learn how to refer students to professional help when their problems exceed my abiliities to help them myself.

(34) Develop an awareness of the effect of physical environment on learning and to take responsibility for maintaining proper heat, light, ventilation and sound control.

(35) Learn to protect confidential information about children and to refrain from unprofessional judgments about colleagues and parents.

(36) Learn how the principal's responsibilities facilitate the instructional program in the school.

Category E: Communicating.

(37) Learn what others in a community expect from me as a teacher.

(38) Develop a style of communicating with parents which help them clearly understand the factors which help or hinder their child's learning and development.

(39) Communicate effectively with students in large group situations.

(40) Communicate effectively with students in small group situations.

(41) Communicate effectively with students on a one-to-one basis.

(42) Communicate with students who are "turned off" by the normal school situation in such a way that their motivations to learn are increased.

(43) Learn how my assumptions about others influence the way in which I deal with individual students, parents, other teachers and administrators.

(44) Increase my job-seeking skills by improving my own ability to personally describe and write about my strengths and limitations as a teacher.

(45) Increase the openness of my relationships with students, other teachers and parents.

(46) Learn how to express my frustration and anger in a productive (constructive) way.

(47) Learn how my actions and feelings determine my effectiveness as a teacher.

(48) Learn what students use as criteria to judge my effectivess as a teacher.

(49) Show that I am aware of how individual students feel about themselves and in a way which helps promote a more positive learning climate.

(50) Communicate effectively with my supervisor and principal.

(51) Respond constructively to students who are hostile toward me.

(52) Help resolve classroom conflict and stress.

Category F: Developing personal skills.

(53) Accept responsibility for monitoring my own professional development and for setting objectives for my own further growth and development.

(54) Determine if I have adequate understandings of the mental, emotional, social, and physical development of boys and girls.

(55) Determine if I have an adequate knowledge of basic subject matter.

(56) Decide if teaching is what I really want, and can do.

(57) Learn what helps or hinders my commitment to teaching.

(58) Increase my ability to act and think objectively.

(59) Learn to use student feedback to improve myself as a teacher.

(60) Objectively assess my own teaching behaviors in order to develop a teaching style which best uses my talents and personality.

Category G: Developing pupil self.

(61) Help a student improve his self-concept.

(62) Learn where my responsibility ends and a student's begins for his own learning.

(63) Develop skill in motivating students to take prime responsibility for measuring their own achievement progress toward specified learning objectives.

(64) Help students plan and carry out their own learning activities.

(65) Help students to set reasonable educational goals which are in tune with their capabilities and motivations.

(66) Learn to predict student behaviors which are disruptive to the group or other persons and to help these students relearn more appropriate social behaviors.

(67) Help students to improve their group discussion skills.

(68) Ask questions which motivate students to think clearly and deeply about ideas and concepts.

APPENDIX C

(Form 1)

APPENDIX C

Student Survey
Telephone Survey for SITE Project

Date_____ Center_____ Non-Center_____

Name_____ Phone No. School_____

Grade Level_____ Phone No. Home_____

This is a follow-up on the questionnaires you have completed recently regarding your expectations and accomplishments during your student teaching experience. Would you be willing to answer two additional questions?

What factors aided you in accomplishing your goals during your student teaching program outside of your resources?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

What factors hindered you from accomplishing your goals?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

Do you have any further comments on this subject?

(Use Other Side)

APPENDIX D

TABLES I - XVIII

TABLE I: PERCENT OF RETURN OF INSTRUMENTS

Instrument	Distributed	Returned	Percent Response
1. Student Teacher Expectations			
A. Center	129	57	44.1%
B. Non-center	185	130	70.2%
2. Cooperating Teacher Expectations			
A. Center	129	58	44.9%
B. Non-center	185	114	61.6%
3. Student Teacher Accomplishments			
A. Center	57	45	78.9%
B. Non-center	130	94	72.3%
4. Cooperating Teacher Accomplishments			
A. Center	58	47	81.0%
B. Non-center	114	95	83.3%
Grand Total Instruments	987	640	64.8%

TABLE II. TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH MATCHED SAMPLE CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS HAD DIFFERENT LEVELS OF EXPECTATIONS FROM NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS

Item No.	Mean Expectations		T-Value	Probability
	Center	Non-Center		
11	8.6071	7.6296	3.13	.003
24	5.7500	7.0000	-2.15	.036
57	8.2143	7.1786	2.66	.010
59	8.5357	7.9286	2.14	.037

TABLE III: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH MATCHED SAMPLE (C) CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS SELF-RATED THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS HIGHER THAN DID NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Accomplishments		T-Value	Probability
	Center	Non-Center		
56	8.7857	8.0714	2.19	.016
65	7.2593	6.3571	1.82	.037

TABLE IV: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH MATCHED SAMPLE (C) CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS SELF-RATED THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS LOWER THAN DID NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Accomplishments		T-Value	Probability
	Center	Non-Center		
5	6.5357	7.6786	-1.72	.046
6	6.8571	7.7500	-2.29	.013
28	3.9643	5.3333	-1.84	.036
31	7.7143	8.5357	-1.95	.028
33	5.2500	6.8571	-2.35	.012
34	6.3214	7.4643	-2.03	.023
37	4.7500	6.2857	-1.98	.026
38	3.2143	4.7407	-2.07	.021
C	6.4554	7.3036	-2.89	.003

TABLE V: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH MATCHED SAMPLE COOPERATING TEACHERS' RATINGS OF CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS' ACCOMPLISHMENTS WERE LOWER THAN THOSE OF NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS

Item No.	Mean Accomplishments		T-Value	Probability
	Center	Non-Center		
32	7.3333	8.[illegible]	-2.08	.042
35	6.9286	8.[illegible]	-2.88	.006
36	5.9643	7.3571	-2.63	.011
50	6.9286	7.9[illegible]	-2.33	.023

TABLE VI: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH MATCHED SAMPLE COOPERATING TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS FOR CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS WERE LOWER THAN THOSE FOR NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Expectations		T-Value	Probability
	Center	Non-Center		
6	6.6296	7.9643	-2.66	.005
9	6.7857	7.9643	-2.22	.015
10	6.9643	8.0357	-2.18	.016
11	7.1786	8.0000	-1.87	.033
12	5.2857	6.8214	-2.74	.004
13	6.8214	7.7500	-1.69	.048
16	5.1786	6.8519	-2.81	.003
19	7.9643	8.5556	-1.84	.036
21	7.0714	8.1111	-2.30	.012
23	7.5714	8.2963	-2.13	.019
24	5.9286	7.0741	-2.21	.015
27	6.7500	7.7143	-2.20	.016
28	4.2500	5.4815	-1.74	.043
31	6.3929	7.7143	-2.11	.019
35	7.3929	8.2963	-2.09	.021
36	5.2857	7.0741	-3.29	.001
37	4.9643	6.3704	-2.64	.005
39	6.9643	8.5556	-3.38	.000
40	8.2143	8.7778	-2.26	.014
41	8.5000	8.8519	-1.85	.035
44	5.6071	6.7857	-1.71	.046
50	6.5000	8.1429	-3.50	.000
55	7.2143	8.1852	-2.51	.007
56	7.7857	8.5926	-2.66	.005
57	6.9286	7.9630	-2.26	.014
58	6.6786	7.8148	-2.05	.023
59	7.1786	8.2222	-2.25	.014
62	6.4815	8.1111	-3.63	.000
66	6.7407	7.9630	-2.95	.002
68	7.3333	8.1111	-1.86	.034
B	6.5238	7.3274	-2.09	.020
C	7.0619	7.7786	-2.52	.007
D	6.2634	7.0446	-1.87	.033
E	6.6996	7.6134	-2.99	.002
F	7.1473	7.8935	-2.41	.009
G	6.7546	7.3657	-1.79	.040

TABLE VII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS ACCOMPLISHED MORE THAN THEY EXPECTED.

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishment	T-Value	Probability
8	6.5000	7.7500	-2.11	.044
25	7.6429	8.5000	-2.25	.033
30	6.7778	7.8519	-2.74	.011

TABLE VIII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS ACCOMPLISHED LESS THAN THEY EXPECTED

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishment	T-Value	Probability
6	7.8214	6.8571	4.04	.000
11	8.6071	7.7143	3.32	.003
12	5.6786	3.8214	2.61	.015
33	7.4074	5.1481	4.42	.000
38	5.6786	3.2143	3.68	.001
42	8.0357	6.4286	3.90	.001
51	7.8929	7.1786	2.05	.050
63	7.6429	6.5714	2.12	.044

TABLE IX: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS ACCOMPLISHED MORE THAN THEY EXPECTED

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishment	T-Value	Probability
5	6.5714	7.6786	-2.20	.036
25	8.0357	8.6071	-2.59	.015
30	6.1071	7.9286	-3.69	.001
31	7.5714	8.5357	-2.54	.017
36	5.7500	7.1071	-2.61	.015
44	6.6786	7.7143	-2.07	.048
Category D	6.7009	7.3036	-2.98	.006

TABLE X: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH NON-CENTER STUDENT TEACHERS ACCOMPLISHED LESS THAN THEY EXPECTED

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishment	T-Value	Probability
2	6.1852	5.2222	2.44	.022
14	8.3704	7.7407	2.57	.016
38	6.0370	4.7407	2.19	.038
42	8.1071	6.9643	4.15	.000
60	8.2143	7.6429	2.08	.047

TABLE XI: UPPER QUARTILE OF MEAN EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

	Student Teachers (N=56)						Cooperating Teachers (N=56)					
	Center (N=28)			Non-Center (N=28)			Center (N=28)			Non-Center (N=28)		
Rank	Item No.	Mean	SD	Item No.	Mean	SD	Item No.	Mean	SD	Item No.	Mean	SD
1	41	8.4545	0.999	41	8.3208	1.341	41	8.6170	0.768	40	8.6667	0.729
2	40	8.3864	0.945	40	8.3019	1.137	40	8.3404	1.069	41	8.6333	0.938
3	59	8.3778	0.912	14	8.2692	1.122	32	8.1489	1.021	19	8.4500	1.016
4	11	8.2889	0.920	39	8.2075	0.968	19	8.0638	1.223	56	8.4333	0.998
5	19	8.2444	0.908	60	8.1321	1.161	25	7.9787	1.539	39	8.3000	1.046
6	26	8.2045	1.047	19	8.0943	1.079	56	7.9149	1.316	25	8.2667	1.517
7	10	8.1556	1.107	68	8.0377	1.176	26	7.8936	1.108	35	8.2000	1.560
8	60	8.1556	1.127	42	8.0000	1.299	15	7.7447	1.343	55	8.1500	1.039
9	57	8.1333	1.160	50	8.9811	1.308	35	7.7447	1.687	32	8.1000	1.285
10	58	8.1333	1.392	45	7.9811	1.421	60	7.6809	1.400	59	8.0833	1.062
11	42	8.0909	1.273	56	7.9811	2.108	23	7.5532	1.486	60	8.0000	1.135
12	56	8.0889	2.043	15	7.9808	1.180	14	7.5319	2.041	26	7.9667	1.164
13	14	8.0000	1.087	59	7.9623	1.270	18	7.4681	1.442	10	7.9508	1.040
14	62	7.9556	1.147	26	7.9623	1.480	5	7.4681	1.558	57	7.9333	1.388
15	47	7.8889	1.191	53	7.9615	1.400	59	7.4681	2.041	68	7.9000	1.734
16	51	7.8867	1.290	58	7.9434	1.322	68	7.4222	1.373	50	7.8525	1.289
17	27	7.8864	1.543	55	7.9434	1.537	39	7.4043	2.018	15	7.9525	1.352

TABLE XII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS RATED STUDENT TEACHERS AS ACCOMPLISHING MORE THAN THEY WERE EXPECTED.

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishments	T-Value	Probability
7	5.4444	6,9630	-2.40	.024
16	5.1786	7.0000	-3.63	.001
28	4.2963	5.5556	-2.32	.029
30	6.0385	7.3462	-2.42	.023
31	6.2963	7.6296	-2.49	.020

TABLE XIII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS RATED STUDENT TEACHERS AS ACCOMPLISHING LESS THAN THEY WERE EXPECTED.

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishments	T-Value	Probability
18	7.8214	7.0714	2.18	.038
19	7.9643	6.9643	2.53	.018
38	5.6296	4.1111	2.91	.007
42	7.2857	5.7857	3.52	.002
47	7.3571	6.7143	2.14	.042
52	7.2143	6.1429	2.47	.020

TABLE XIV: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH NON-CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS RATED THEIR STUDENT TEACHERS AS ACCOMPLISHING LESS THEN THEY WERE EXPECTED.

Item No.	Mean Expectations	Mean Accomplishments	T-Value	Probability
11	8.0000	7.1429	2.10	.045
12	6.8214	5.2500	3.20	.004
13	7.7500	7.0357	2.23	.034
14	8.2857	7.0714	3.01	.006
15	8.0000	7.2857	2.12	.043
19	8.5556	7.4815	2.82	.009
21	8.1111	6.8519	3.49	.002
23	8.2963	7.1852	2.64	.014
33	7.4286	6.3214	2.25	.033
38	6.3462	4.5000	3.51	.002
39	8.5556	7.0370	3.28	.003
42	7.3333	6.2222	2.54	.018
59	8.2222	7.0741	2.35	.027
62	8.1111	6.8519	3.01	.006
66	7.9630	6.2963	3.00	.006
C	7.7786	7.0857	2.61	.015

TABLE XV: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS WERE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE OF THEIR STUDENT TEACHERS

Item No.	Mean Expectations		T-Value	Probability
	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher		
3	7.5600	6.8400	2.22	.036
9	6.7857	8.0000	-2.41	.023
10	6.9643	8.4286	-3.01	.006
11	7.1786	8.6071	-4.03	.000
16	5.1786	6.9286	-2.61	.015
36	5.2857	6.7500	-2.77	.010
42	7.2857	8.0357	-2.16	.040
44	5.6071	7.3214	-2.86	.008
46	6.3929	7.5000	-2.30	.029
51	7.0357	7.8929	-2.10	.045
57	6.9286	8.2143	-3.47	.002
58	6.6786	8.0357	-2.39	.024
59	7.1786	8.5357	-3.08	.005
61	7.1481	7.8889	-2.15	.041
62	6.4815	8.0741	-3.46	.002
63	6.5926	7.5926	-2.26	.033
E	6.6996	7.3782	-2.37	.025
F	7.1473	8.0446	-3.10	.005
G	6.7543	7.5694	-2.68	.013

TABLE XVI: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH NON-CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS WERE HIGHER THAN THOSE OF THEIR STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Expectations		T-Value	Probability
	Cooperating Teachers	Student Teachers		
36	7.0741	5.7037	2.55	.017
56	8.5926	7.5556	2.17	.040

TABLE XVII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS' RATINGS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS WERE DIFFERENT FROM THOSE OF THEIR STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Accomplishments		T-Value	Probability
	Cooperating Teachers	Student Teachers		
10	7.1786	8.0714	-2.40	.024
14	6.9286	7.6429	-2.26	.032
25	7.6429	8.5000	-2.52	.018
28	5.5556	3.9259	2.76	.010
32	7.3333	8.3333	-2.70	.012
40	7.8214	8.5714	-2.73	.011
41	8.2857	8.8571	-2.59	.015
43	5.9286	6.8571	-2.37	.025
44	5.9643	7.3571	-2.54	.017
47	6.7143	8.0000	-3.77	.001
50	6.9286	7.9643	-2.49	.019
52	6.1429	7.5000	-3.72	.001
53	7.0714	7.9286	-2.06	.050
54	6.6429	7.6786	-3.05	.005
56	7.3462	8.8462	-3.40	.002
57	7.1786	8.1786	-2.43	.022
59	7.0357	8.0000	-2.43	.022
60	7.1429	8.0000	-2.25	.033
61	6.6786	7.4643	-2.38	.025
E	6.4034	7.0441	-2.19	.037
F	7.2589	8.0938	-2.87	.008
G	6.6920	7.3884	-2.15	.041

TABLE XVIII: TEACHER BEHAVIORS ON WHICH NON-CENTER COOPERATING TEACHERS' RATINGS ACCOMPLISHMENTS WERE LOWER THAN THOSE OF THEIR STUDENT TEACHERS.

Item No.	Mean Accomplishments		T-Value	Probability
	Cooperating Teachers	Student Teachers		
21	6.8929	7.8214	-2.21	.036
34	6.1786	7.4643	-2.35	.026
45	7.1071	8.1429	-2.73	.011
48	6.3704	7.4444	-2.12	.044
49	7.0741	7.9259	-2.53	.018
61	6.9259	7.8148	-2.40	.024